



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/521,283	03/07/00	COOPER		Т	32272-00024
Jenkins & Gilchrist 3200 Fountain Place 1445 Ross Avenue Dallas TX 75202-2799		QM32/0723			EXAMINER
		(100 mm)	[LEWIS.	.K
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				3761	(
				DATE MAILED:	
					07/23/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/521,283

Applicant(s)

Cooper

Exeminer

Kim M. Lewis

Art Unit



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be evailable under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed efter SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any eerned petent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 1) X Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6/21/00 and 7/7/00 2b) This action is non-final. 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) 💢 Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above, claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) 6) X Claim(s) 1-34 ______is/are rejected. 7) X Claim(s) 35-40 is/are objected to. are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 8) Claims ___ Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on ______ is/are objected to by the Examiner. 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ______ is: a) approved b) disapproved. 12) \square The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). a) \square All b) \square Some * c) \square None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). Attachment(s) 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summery (PTO-413) Peper No(s). 16) Notice of Dreftsperson'e Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 17) X Information Discloeure Statement(e) (PTO-1449) Paper No(e) 2 and 3 20) Other: Detailed Action

Application/Control Number: 09/521283

Art Unit: 3761

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement papers filed 6/21/00 and 7/7/00 have been received, 1.

which papers have been made of record in the application file wrapper.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to because Figs. 1, 2 and 5 do not include cross-hatchings. 2.

Correction is required.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every 3.

feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "air intake" and the "reservoir"

must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the

claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the

following is required: the phrases "entry point" recited in claim 7 and "worm drive" recited in

claim 18, lack antecedent basis in the specification.

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 24, lines 9-5.

10, the applicant designates reference numeral 4 as representing both the door and the floor.

Page 2

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claims 1-30 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. More specifically, the "grounding connection" in claim 1 and "the step of grounding the human" recited in claim 34 are not described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 9. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,494,674 ("Barnett et al.").

As regards claim 31, Barnett et al. disclose a skin treatment system which delivers skin treatment agents to the skin by electrostatic spraying. Barnett et al. disclose the claimed method steps of providing a coating solution, providing an electrostatic nozzle for spraying the coating solution, atomizing the coating solution, directing the electrically changed and atomized coating solution towards the human, and depositing at least a portion of electrically charged and atomized coating solution on the human (co1. 2, line 53-col. 4, line 38 and col. 6, lines 55-61).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 11. Claims 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,494,674 ("Barnett et al.").

As regards claims 32 and 33, it is unclear from the disclosure which occurs first, atomizing the coating solution or electrically charging the coating solution; however, absent a critical teaching and/or a showing of unexpected results derived from performing the atomizing step before the electrically charging or performing the electrically charging step before the

atomizing step, the examiner contends that the order in which the two steps are performed are an obvious design choice.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 12. Claim 1 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action.
- 13. Claims 2-30 and 34 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 14. Claims 35-40 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim M. Lewis whose telephone number is (703) 308-1191. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Thursdays from 5:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John weiss, can be reached on (703) 308-2702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3590.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

kml

July 13, 2001

KIN M. LEWIS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10 3268